

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Official Action mailed November 12, 2004 and the Advisory Action mailed February 4, 2005. Reconsideration of the application in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the recent final Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 29, 30, 35-45 and 48-56. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the allowance of these claims.

With regard to the prior art, the Examiner under U.S.C. § 103(a) rejects claims 1-5 and 22 as being unpatentable over Batchelder et al., claims 6, 7 and 23 as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Batchelder et al., Lawton and Gelbart, and claims 25-28 and 31-34 as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Batchelder et al., Lawton, Gelbart, Lin and Mercer. While Applicant continues to traverse this rejection for the reasons of record, in order to expedite issuance of the allowed claims, rejected claims 1-28, 31-34 and 46-47 have been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant expressly reserves the right to file a continuation or divisional application to the cancelled claims or to any subject matter described by the present application.


Consequently, following entry of this amendment, only allowed claims 29, 30, 35-45 and 48-56 remain. Therefore, as determined by the Examiner, the application should be in condition for allowance.

Entry and consideration of this amendment are proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 for at least the following reasons. The present amendment makes only those changes necessary to place the application in condition for allowance as indicated by the Examiner. The

amendment does not raise new issues requiring further search or consideration. And, based on the indications of the Examiner, the present amendment clearly places the application in condition for allowance. Therefore, entry of the present amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 116 and is hereby requested.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the present application is thought to be clearly in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application in light of these remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven L. Nichols
Registration No. 40,326


DATE: 14 February 2005

Steven L. Nichols, Esq.
Managing Partner, Utah Office
Rader Fishman & Grauer PLLC
River Park Corporate Center One
10653 S. River Front Parkway, Suite 150
South Jordan, Utah 84095
(801) 572-8066
(801) 572-7666 (fax)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

DATE OF DEPOSIT: February 14, 2005

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date indicated above in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.


Rebecca R. Schow